arXiv:math/9210204v1 [math.LO] 27 Oct 1992

SPLITTING NUMBER AND THE CORE MODEL

Jindřich Zapletal

The Pennsylvania State University

Abstract. We provide a lower bound for the consistency strength of the hypothesis proposed by S. Kamo: $\exists\kappa > \aleph_0 \; s(\kappa) \geq \kappa^{++}$.

0. Introduction.

In [3] ,[10] cardinal invariants on ω are generalized for uncountable regular cardinals and it is shown that some of their properties still hold true for their uncountable counterparts.However,the role of the splitting number $s(\kappa)$ (for the definition see below) changes significantly. As Suzuki [10] observed,existence of $\kappa > \aleph_0$ regular such that $s(\kappa) \geq \kappa^{++}$ implies existence of inner models with measurable cardinals and later Kamo [5] proved that $\exists\kappa > \aleph_0 \; s(\kappa) \geq \kappa^{++}$ is consistent provided there is 2^κ-supercompact cardinal κ.Here we give a lower bound for the consistency strength of the statement $\exists\kappa > \aleph_0 \; s(\kappa) \geq \kappa^{++}$.

Theorem. *Cons* ($\exists\kappa > \aleph_0 \; s(\kappa) \geq \kappa^{++}$) $\rightarrow$ *Cons* ($\exists\alpha \; o(\alpha) \geq \alpha^{++}$).

1. Preliminaries.

Definition 1. *If κ is a regular cardinal,we define the splitting number of κ ,*

$$s(\kappa) = min\{|\mathcal{S}| : \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \;\&\; \forall a \in \kappa^\kappa \; \exists b \in \mathcal{S} \; |a \cap b| = |a \setminus b| = \kappa\}$$

Such $\mathcal{S}$'s will be called splitting families.If $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ is not splitting then there is a counterexample $A \in \kappa^\kappa$.We say that A cuts $\mathcal{S}$.

Now suppose $s(\kappa) \geq \kappa^{++}$ for some $\kappa > \aleph_0$ regular and M is an inner model satisfying GCH.Then we observe that $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap M$ is not a splitting family and thus there is A cutting $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap M$. $F = \{b \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap M : |A \cap b| = \kappa\}$ is a weakly κ-complete M-ultrafilter: if $\langle b_\alpha : \alpha < \beta < \kappa\rangle$ is a subset of F we have $\forall\alpha < \beta \; |A \setminus b_\alpha| < \kappa$ and so $|A \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha<\beta} b_\alpha| < \kappa$, $|A \cap \bigcap_{\alpha<\beta} b_\alpha| = \kappa$,in particular $\bigcap_{\alpha<\beta} b_\alpha \neq 0$.Hence we have a wellfounded ultrapower N of M and an elementary embedding $j : M \rightarrow N$, $crit(j) = \kappa$.

These facts justify the following definitions:

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* .

Key words and phrases. Splitting number,core model.

The author would like to thank Prof. T. J. Jech for infinite discussions on the subject and Prof. W. J. Mitchell for his interest.

Definition 2. *Let $\mathcal{M} = \langle M, \in, \lessdot, \dots \rangle$ be either an inner model of set theory where $\lessdot$ is a wellordering of the universe,a class in M,or a set model of a fraction of ZFC, not necessarily transitive,$\kappa \subset M$,where $\in$ is the "real" $\in$ relation and $\lessdot$ is a wellordering of M.For $S \subset M$, $S \in M$ we define*

$$Def(\mathcal{M}, S)$$

to be the set of all subsets of S first-order definable over $\mathcal{M}$. Obviously in the inner model case without further special predicates, this reduces to $\mathcal{P}(S) \cap M$.If $Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$ is not a splitting family and A cuts it,we define

$$F_A^{\mathcal{M}} = \{a \in Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa) : |a \cap A| = \kappa\}$$

As observed above,this is a weakly κ-complete filter (or rather centered system).In this case we define

$$Ult_A^{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{M}$$

to be the ultrapower of $\mathcal{M}$ by first-order definable over $\mathcal{M}$ functions from κ to M factorized by $F_A^{\mathcal{M}}$. Łoś's theorem for $Ult_A^{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{M}$ goes through due to the built-in wellordering and we get an elementary

$$j_A^{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \to Ult_A^{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{M}$$

Before we proceed to the proof of the Theorem,one easy lemma.

Lemma 3. *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is as in the Definition 2, A cuts $Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$, $S \in M$, $S \subset M$ and f is a first-order definable over $\mathcal{M}$ function,$f : \kappa \to S$, $\forall s \in S$ $f^{-1}s \notin F_A^{\mathcal{M}}$.Then*

$$F_{f''A,S}^{\mathcal{M}} = \{a \in \mathcal{P}(S) \cap Def(\mathcal{M}, S) : |a \cap f''A| = \kappa\}$$

is again a weakly κ-complete $Def(\mathcal{M}, S)$-ultrafilter.

Proof. Suppose $a \in Def(\mathcal{M}, S)$ so $b = f^{-1}a \in Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$.If $|a \cap f''A| < \kappa$ then the small preimages of singletons in S guarantee $|b \cap A| < \kappa$.We get $|a \cap f''A| = \kappa$ iff $|b \cap A| = \kappa$ iff $|A \setminus b| < \kappa$ iff $|f''A \setminus a| < \kappa$ and we are through.

Corollary 4. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is as in the Definition 2 and $Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$ is not a splitting family,it is possible to choose A cutting $Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$ such that $F_A^{\mathcal{M}}$ is normal w.r.t. functions first-order definable over $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. Choose A' arbitrary cutting $Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$ and consider $Ult_{A'}^{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{M}$ and f first-order definable over $\mathcal{M}$ representing κ.W.l.o.g. $f : \kappa \to \kappa$.We claim that $A = f''A'$ is just what we need.f does not represent any $\alpha < \kappa$, and so $\forall \alpha < \kappa$ $|f^{-1}\alpha \cap A| < \kappa$. Lemma 3 applies and $A = f''A'$ cuts $Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$.Suppose g is a $\mathcal{M}$-definable regressive ordinal function,$|dom(g) \cap A| = \kappa$.Then $g \circ f$ represents some $\alpha < \kappa$ in $Ult_{A'}^{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{M}$.It follows that $|(g \circ f)^{-1}(\alpha) \cap A'| = \kappa$,by small preimages of singletons in κ $|g^{-1}(\alpha) \cap f''A'| = \kappa$ and α is the wanted stabilizing value for g.

2. Proof of the Theorem.

From now on,we fix $\kappa > \aleph_0$ regular with $s(\kappa) \geq \kappa^{++}$ and suppose that there are no inner models of $\exists\alpha\ o(\alpha) \geq \alpha^{++}$ .Toward the end of the paper,we arrive at contradiction from these assumptions, proving the Theorem. Recall the basic properties of Mitchell's core model $\mathbf{K}$ for a sequence of measures [8]:

(1) $\mathbf{K} \models$ "ZFC,GCH,measures are wellordered, there is a definable wellordering of the universe"

and if there are no inner models of $\exists\alpha\ o(\alpha) \geq \alpha^{++}$ (our assumption) then

(2) every $j : \mathbf{K} \to M$ is an iteration of measures in $\mathbf{K}$,
(3) if F is a $\mathbf{K}$-normal $\mathbf{K}$-ultrafilter such that $Ult_F\mathbf{K}$ is wellfounded then $F \in \mathbf{K}$.

It follows from our assumptions that $\mathbf{K} \models$ "κ is measurable" . $|\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbf{K}| = (\kappa^+)^{\mathbf{K}} < \kappa^{++}$ and we have A cutting $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbf{K}$ .By Lemma 3, A can be chosen such that $F_A^{\mathbf{K}}$ is $\mathbf{K}$-normal and hence belongs to $\mathbf{K}$.

Still one more preparatory lemma.

Lemma 5. *Suppose M,N are inner models and $j : M \to N$ is an iteration $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \gamma, j_{\alpha,\beta} : M_\alpha \to M_\beta : \alpha < \beta \leq \gamma\rangle$ where $M = M_0$,$N = M_\gamma$, $j_{\alpha,\beta}$ is a commutative system,$M_{\alpha+1}$ is an ultrapower of M_α by M_α-measure $U_\alpha \in M_\alpha$ and at limit steps we take direct limits.Then if $\kappa = crit(j)$ we have $V_{\kappa+1}^M = V_{\kappa+1}^N$.*

Proof. We prove by induction on $\alpha \leq \gamma$ that $V_{\kappa+1}^M = V_{\kappa+1}^{M_\alpha}$.The succesor step is trivial since we assume that $U_\alpha \in M_\alpha$ and $\kappa = min\{crit(j_{\alpha,\alpha+1})\}$.Suppose now that $\alpha \leq \gamma$ is limit and $\forall\alpha' < \alpha\ V_{\kappa+1}^M = V_{\kappa+1}^{M_{\alpha'}}$.By wellfoundedness of M_α,there were only finitely many ultrapowers taken at κ and we have $\beta < \alpha$ such that $\forall\beta < \alpha' < \alpha\ crit(j_{\alpha',\alpha'+1}) > \kappa$.Thus, $V_{\kappa+1}^{M_\alpha} = dirlim_{\beta<\alpha'<\alpha} V_{\kappa+1}^{M_{\alpha'}} = V_{\kappa+1}^M$.

Now we proceed directly to the contradiction proving the Theorem. The strategy is to find κ^{++} different normal $\mathbf{K}$-measures on κ.Our measures will be of the form $F_A^{\mathbf{K}}$ for some A. The problem is,how should we choose $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^{++}\rangle$ so that it is guaranteed $\alpha < \beta < \kappa^{++} \to F_{A_\alpha}^{\mathbf{K}} \neq F_{A_\beta}^{\mathbf{K}}$?

Choose $\lambda \gg \kappa$ strongly limit,$\lessdot$ a wellordering of H_λ.Pick $A_0 \subset \kappa$ such that A_0 cuts $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbf{K}$ and $F_{A_0}^{\mathbf{K}}$ is $\mathbf{K}$-normal.Further choose

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle M, \in, \lessdot, M \cap \mathbf{K}\rangle \prec \langle H_\lambda, \in, \lessdot, H_\lambda \cap \mathbf{K}\rangle$$

arbitrary with $A_0 \in M$,$V_{\kappa+1}^{\mathbf{K}} \subset M$ and $|M| \leq \kappa^+$.This is possible since $\mathbf{K} \models$ "κ is measurable" and so $|V_{\kappa+1}^{\mathbf{K}}| = (\kappa^+)^{\mathbf{K}} \leq \kappa^+$.It follows that $|Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)| \leq \kappa^+$ and $Def(\mathcal{M}, \kappa)$ is not a splitting family.Choose A_1 cutting it such that $F_{A_1}^{\mathcal{M}}$ is normal w.r.t. functions first-order definable over $\mathcal{M}$.We get

$$j_{A_1}^{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \to Ult_{A_1}^{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{M} \simeq \langle N, \in, \lessdot^*, N_0\rangle$$

where N is the transitive collapse of the universe of $Ult_{A_1}^{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{M}$.$crit(j_{A_1}^{\mathcal{M}}) = \kappa$ and by restriction,

$$j_{A_1}^{\mathcal{M}} : M \cap \mathbf{K} \to N_0$$

Note that $\mathbf{K}$ is transitive and so by elementarity $N \models$ "N_0 is transitive",hence N_0 is "really" transitive

Claim 6. $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap N_0 = \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbf{K}$.

Proof. Obviously for any $a \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbf{K}$ $j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}(a) \cap \kappa = a \in N_0$.For the other inclusion,fix $a \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap N_0$.Then there is f first-order definable over $\mathcal{M}$ such that $[f]_{F^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}} = a$.W.l.o.g. we can suppose $f : \kappa \to V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa}$.We distinguish two cases: either for some $s \in \kappa^{<\kappa} \cap \mathbf{K}$ $a = j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}(s) = s$.Then we have $a \in \mathbf{K}$ and we are done.Or, $\forall s \in V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa}$ $|f^{-1}s \cap A_1| < \kappa$. In this case,define

$$U = \{b \in V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa+1} : a \in j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}(b)\}. \tag{1}$$

Now by standard arguments and Lemma 3,

$$U = \{b \in V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa+1} : |b \cap f''A_1| = \kappa\} = F^{\mathbf{K}}_{f''A_1, V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa}} \tag{2}$$

From (2) and small preimages of singletons,U is weakly κ-complete $\mathbf{K}$-ultrafilter. From (1),the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa} \arrow[r, "j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}"] \arrow[d, equal] & V^{N_0}_{j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}\kappa} \\
V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa} \arrow[r, "j_U"] & V^{N_1}_{j_U\kappa} \arrow[u, "k"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $j_U : \mathbf{K} \to N_1$ is given by U (thus N_1 is wellfounded) and $k([g]_U) = (j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1} g)(a)$ for any $g \in \mathbf{K}$, $g : \kappa \to V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa}$.Note that such g belongs to $V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa+1}$ and the definition of k makes sense. $crit(k) \geq \kappa$, $k[id]_U = a$ and $[id]_U = a$.Thus $a \in V^{N_1}_{\kappa+1}$.But j_U is an iteration of measures in $\mathbf{K}$ with critical point $= \kappa$,Lemma 5 applies and we have $V^{N_1}_{\kappa+1} = V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa+1}$,thus $a \in \mathbf{K}$.*Fini.*

(W. J. Mitchell pointed out a different proof of this fact using the fine structure of $\mathbf{K}$.)Thus $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_0}$ is a weakly κ-complete N_0-normal N_0-ultrafilter.Since

$$\langle H_\lambda, H_\lambda \cap \mathbf{K}\rangle \models \text{"All weakly } \omega\text{-complete } H_\lambda \cap \mathbf{K}\text{-normal } H_\lambda \cap \mathbf{K}\text{-ulf's are in } H_\lambda \cap \mathbf{K}\text{"}$$

the same sentence is modeled in $\mathcal{M}$ about $M \cap \mathbf{K}$ and by elementarity N says the same about N_0.Now notice that $j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}(A_0) \cap \kappa = A_0 \in N$ and get $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_0} \in N_0$. At this point we observe that $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} = F^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1} \cap \mathbf{K}$ and go on to prove $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} \neq F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_0}$.

Claim 7. $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} \neq F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_0}$.

Proof. Similar as for the previous Claim.Suppose $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} = F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_0}$.Then $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} \in N_0$, $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} = [f]_{F^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}}$ for some $f : \kappa \to V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa}$ first-order definable over $\mathcal{M}$. As before,define $U = \{b \in V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa+1} : |b \cap f''A_1| = \kappa\} = \{b \in V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa+1} : F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} \in j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}(b)\}$.Again,$U$ is weakly κ-complete $\mathbf{K}$-ultrafilter and the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa} \arrow[r, "j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}"] \arrow[d, equal] & V^{N_0}_{j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1}\kappa} \\
V^{\mathbf{K}} \arrow[r, "j_U"] & V^{N_2} \arrow[u, "k"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here $j_U : \mathbf{K} \to N_2$ is generated by U and N_2 is therefore wellfounded.k is defined by $k([g]_U) = (j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1} g)(F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1})$ for any $g \in \mathbf{K}$,$g : \kappa \to V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa}$. $k[id]_U = F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1}$ and $crit(k) > \kappa$,since κ is definable from $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1}$.Now j_U is an iteration of measures in $\mathbf{K}$,by commutativity of iteration we can suppose that the (finitely many) ultrapowers on κ were taken first.Thus $j_U = j'_U \circ j_{U_n} \circ j_{U_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ j_{U_0}$ for some $n < \omega$,$\mathbf{K}$-measures U_i on κ, $U_i \in \mathbf{K}$ for $i \leq n$, $crit(j'_U) > \kappa$ and j'_U is an iteration.Set $N_3 = j_{U_n} \circ j_{U_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ j_{U_0}(\mathbf{K})$. Lemma 5 applies and $V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa+1} = V^{N_2}_{\kappa+1}$, $V^{N_2}_{\kappa+2} = V^{N_3}_{\kappa+2}$.Now we conclude that $[id]_U = F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} \in N_2$. ($\forall a \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbf{K}$ $a \in [id]_U$ iff $k(a) = a \in F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1}$.)By standard arguments, $V^{N_3}_{\kappa+2} = V^{Ult^{\mathbf{K}}_{U_n} \mathbf{K}}_{\kappa+2}$, in particular $U_n \notin N_2$.However,as $crit(j'_U) > \kappa$, $U_n = \{a \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbf{K} : \kappa \in j_U a\}$. On the other hand,as $crit(k) > \kappa$, $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} = \{a \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbf{K} : \kappa \in j^{\mathcal{M}}_{A_1} a\} = \{a \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathbf{K} : \kappa \in j_U a\} = U_n$, $U_n \in N_2$,contradiction.

(In fact,this gives $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_1} > F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_0}$ in the Mitchell order.) Now it is easy to construct κ^{++} different weakly κ-complete $\mathbf{K}$-normal $\mathbf{K}$-measures on κ: by induction on $\alpha < \kappa^{++}$choose $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$, $\mathcal{M}_\alpha = \langle M_\alpha, \in, \lessdot, M_\alpha \cap \mathbf{K}\rangle \prec \langle H_\lambda, \in, \lessdot, H_\lambda \cap \mathbf{K}\rangle$ with $|M_\alpha| \leq \kappa^+$, $V^{\mathbf{K}}_{\kappa+1} \subset M_\alpha$, $\langle A_\beta : \beta < \alpha\rangle \subset M_\alpha$ and A_α cutting $Def(\mathcal{M}_\alpha, \kappa)$ such that $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_\alpha}$ is normal w.r.t. functions first-order definable over $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$. Claims 6 and 7 give that $F^{\mathbf{K}}_{A_\alpha}, \alpha < \kappa^{++}$ are pairwise distinct weakly κ-complete $\mathbf{K}$-normal $\mathbf{K}$-measures,as such they all belong to $\mathbf{K}$ and from wellordering of measures in $\mathbf{K}$ it follows that $o^{\mathbf{K}}(\kappa) \geq \kappa^{++} \geq (\kappa^{++})^{\mathbf{K}}$, the desired contradiction with our assumption.The Theorem is proven.

3. Open problems.

1. There is a wide gap between κ supercompact and κ with $o(\kappa) \geq \kappa^{++}$,calling for further consistency results.
2. Cons ($\aleph_{\omega+2} = min\{|\mathcal{S}| : \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{P}(\aleph_\omega)$ such that $\forall a \in \aleph_\omega^{\aleph_\omega}$ $\exists b \in \mathcal{S}$ $|a \cap b| = |a \setminus b| = \aleph_\omega\}$).

References

1. A. Dodd, *The core model*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes vol. 61, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1982.
2. M. Gitik, *The negation of the singular cardinal hypothesis from $o(\kappa) = \kappa^{++}$*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **43** (1989), 209–234.
3. T. Hasegawa, *Cardinalities of MAD families on uncountable regular cardinals*, preprint.
4. T. J. Jech, *Set theory*, Pure Appl. Math. vol. 79, Academic Press, New York, 1978.
5. S. Kamo, *Splitting numbers on uncountable regular cardinals*, preprint.
6. A. Kanamori, *Large cardinals in set theory I*, in the Press, Springer-Verlag.
7. W. J. Mitchell, *Indiscernibles,skies and ideals*, Cont. Math. **31** (1984), 161–182.
8. W. J. Mitchell, *The core model for sequences of measures I*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **95** (1984), 41–58.
9. W. J. Mitchell, *On the singular cardinal hypothesis*, Trans. AMS **329** (1992), 507–530.
10. T. Suzuki, *About splitting numbers.*

Department of Mathematics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802

E-mail address: `zapletal@math.psu.edu`